

Hiroshi HARA*: Notes on Japanese *Elaeocarpus*.

原 寛*: ホルトノキとコバンモチ

In 1846 Turczaninow described from Japan two new species of *Elaeocarpus*, i.e. *E. japonicus* and *E. dioicus*, which were based on the specimens collected by Zollinger. These names, however, have since been neglected by subsequent botanists. Through the kindness of Dr. Baehni and Dr. Weibel of Genève, I had fortunately an opportunity of examining excellent photographs and fragments of Zollinger's isotype specimens preserved in the DC's Herbarium which agree with Turczaninow's original descriptions. And it became clear that *E. japonicus* based on Zollinger's no. 461 is a common Japanese form ('Horuto-no-ki' in Japanese) which had often been called *E. decipiens* Hemsley, and that *E. dioicus* based on Zollinger's no. 460 coincides perfectly with *E. japonicus* Sieb. et Zucc. ('Koban-mochi' in Japanese).

On this occasion I have critically compared 'Horuto-no-ki' of Japan with *E. decipiens* Hemsley of China. Hemsley in his original description cited specimens from Riukiu, Canton, and also Formosa with a question mark, but he did not designate the type specimen. In the Japanese 'Horuto-no-ki', the sepals are 3-4 mm long and minutely appressed pilose on both sides; the petals are 4-5 mm long, and nearly glabrous except the minutely ciliate margin or sparsely pilose near the base inside; the stamens are 25-34 in number. And in the size, texture and lustre of leaves and the length of pedicels the Japanese plants are considerably variable. The plant of Riukiu is the same as the Japanese form in the size of flowers, the number of stamens and the hairiness of sepals, and its petals are sparsely pilose in the marginal and middle parts of the base inside.

And these Japanese forms which inhabit the warm district of middle Honshu through Shikoku, Kyushu and Quelpaert south to Riukiu and the northern part of Formosa clearly belong to a single species; so if the specimen from Riukiu is regarded as the type of *E. decipiens*, the Japanese 'Horuto-no-ki' apparently belongs to *E. decipiens*.

On the other hand in the specimens from Canton and Hainan which I have examined, the flowers are smaller; the sepals are 3 mm long and

* Botanical Institute, Faculty of Science, University of Tokyo, Hongo, Tokyo.

less hairy outside; the petals are densely minute-pilose in the lower part inside; the stamens are fewer and 14-21 in number. *E. Henryi* Hance described from Canton also seems to be its extreme form; and *E. decipiens*, if the Canton specimen is considered as the type, is probably the same too. This Chinese form, although it looks different from the Japanese one, seems for me to belong to the same species as the latter, for some Chinese specimens cannot be distinguished from the Japanese in the size of flowers or the hairiness of inflorescences; and also it is noticeable that specimens from Formosa, which is situated between Riukiu and China, show some intermediate characters between the two forms. A specimen from Mt. Daiton in northernmost Formosa coincides with the Japanese in having larger flowers, 26-28 stamens, and petals very sparsely pilose inside; whereas one from Bioritsu in north-west Formosa conforms rather to the Chinese in having 19-20 stamens, slightly smaller flowers and petals densely pilose in the lower part inside; but one from Shizangan near Taihoku shows an intermediate form with 21-32 stamens and with petals densely pilose in the lower part inside; and one from Mt. Arisan of middle Formosa is near to the Chinese in having about 20 stamens and petals densely pilose in the lower part inside, but the flowers are larger and the sepals are appressed pilose outside.

Recently *E. sylvestris* Poirét, which is based on *Adenodus sylvestris* Lour. described from Tonkin of Indo-China, is regarded as conspecific with *E. decipiens* of Canton by Dr. Merrill who examined the type of Loureiro in the British Museum. According to the Moore's description from the Loureiro's type, its sepals are glabrous outside and the number of its stamens is 14-17, but the size of its flowers, on the contrary, agrees with that of the Japanese form.

The earliest name for the species in a wide sense including the Japanese and Chinese forms above mentioned is *Prunus elliptica* Thunb., but the combinations, *Elaeocarpus ellipticus* (Thunb.) Makino, cannot be used on account of the presence of the earlier homonym, *E. ellipticus* Smith based on a different plant. Therefore *E. sylvestris* (Lour.) Poirét, as Dr. Merrill suggested, becomes the correct name. Then the Japanese 'Horuto-no-ki' with slightly larger flowers, many stamens, less hairy petals and more hairy sepals will properly be regarded as its geographical variety occupying the

northern part of the area of the whole species; but if one considers it as a separate species from the Indo-Chinese plant, the name *E. Zollingeri* K. Koch based on *E. japonicus* Turcz. should be adopted. The common form in China also seems not exactly to agree with the Loureiro's typical one. And *E. subsessilis* Hand-Mzt. of middle and south China is considered to be an independent species with much larger flowers, glabrous petals, and anthers distinctly fascicled-hairy at the top.

Elaeocarpus japonicus Sieb. et Zucc. is distributed north to the southern and western parts of Honshu, and south to Formosa and the middle and south China. The Formosan plant has leaves which are narrower than the typical form in Japan.

Elaeocarpus sylvestris (Lour.) Poir. in Lamarck, Encycl. Suppl. 2: 704 (1811)—Moore in Journ. Bot. 63: 282 (1925)—Merrill et Chun in Sunyats. 2: 278 (1935)—Merrill in Trans. Amer. Philos. Soc. n. s. 24-2: 256 (1935), excl. syn. nonnull.—Kanehira et Hatusima in Trans. Nat. Hist. Soc. Formos. 29: 156 (1939). *Adenodus sylvestris* Loureiro, Fl. Cochinch. 1: 294 (1790).

var *ellipticus* (Thunb.) Hara, stat. nov.

Prunus elliptica Thunberg, Fl. Jap. 199 (1784). *Cerasus elliptica* (Thunb.) Loiseleur in Duhamel, Traité Arb. ed. nov. 5: 4 (1812)—Seringe in DC., Prodr. 2: 540 (1825). *Elaeocarpus japonicus* Siebold, Syn. Pl. Oecon. Jap. 63 (1830), nom. subnud.; non *E. japonicus* Sieb. et Zucc. 1845. '*Elaeocarpus photiniaefolius* Hooker': Sieb. et Zucc. in Abh. Akad. Wiss. Muench. 4-2: 164 (1845)—Miquel, Ann. Mus. Bot. Lugd.-Bat. 3: 17 (1867)—Shirasawa, Icon. Ess. For. Jap. 2: t. 49, f. 15-27 (1908). *E. japonicus* (non Sieb. et Zucc. 1845) Turczaninow in Bull. Soc. Nat. Moscou 19: 492 (1846), ex isotypo. *E. Zollingeri* K. Koch, Hort. Dendr. 49 (1853). *E. photiniaefolia* var. *angustifolia* Miquel, Cat. Mus. Bot. Lugd.-Bat. 16 (1870), nom. nud. *E. decipiens* Hemsley ex Forbes et Hemsley in Journ. Linn. Soc. 23: 94 (1886), pro parte—Matsum., Ind. Pl. Jap. 2-2: 344 (1912)—Nakai in Bot. Mag. Tokyo 32: 221 (1918)—Kanehira, Formos. Tr. ed. rev. 431, f. 389 (1936)—Makino, Ill. Fl. Jap. ed. rev. 340, f. 1019 (1949). *E. ellipticus* (Thunb.) Makino in Bot. Mag. Tokyo 18: 67 (1904)—Masamune, Fl. & Geo. Stud. Yakus. 292 (1934); non *E. ellipticus* Smith 1809. *E. elliptica* (Thunb.) Nakai in Bot. Mag. Tokyo 32: 221 (1918); Fl. Sylv. Korea. 12: 63, t. 17 (1922). *E. Makinoi* Kanehira ex Hatusima in Bull. Experim. For. Kyushu Univ. 3: 119 (1933); 4: 109 (1934).

Dist. var. *Honshu media calida et occid.*, Shikoku, Kyushu, Quelpaert, Riukiu et Formosa bor.

Elaeocarpus japonicus Sieb. et Zucc. in Abh. Akad. Wiss. Muench. 4-2: 165 (1845), ut *japonica*-Forbes et Hemsley in Journ. Linn. Soc. 23: 95 (1886)-Shirasawa in Icon. Ess. For. Jap. 2: t. 49, f. 1-14 (1908)-Matsum., Ind. 2-2, 345 (1912)-Rehder et Wilson in Pl. Wilson. 2: 360 (1915)-Chun in Sunyats. 1: 267 (1934).

E. japonicus Siebold, Syn. Pl. Oecon. Jap. 63 (1830), nom. subnud., quoad specim. in Herb. Lugd.-Batav., fide Koidzumi-Nakai in Bot. Mag. Tokyo 25: 224 (1911). *E. dioicus* Turczaninow in Bull. Soc. Nat. Moscou 19: 493 (1846), ex isotypo. *E. Kobanmochi* Koidzumi in Bot. Mag. Tokyo 44: 96 (1930)-Masamune, Fl. & Geo. Stud. Yakus. 293 (1934)-Kanehira, Formos. Tr. ed. rev. 433, f. 390 (1936)-Chen, Ill. Man. Chin. Tr. 801 (1937).

Dist. Honshu occid. (Kinki et Chūgoku distr.), Shikoku, Kyushu, Riukiu, Formosa et China (Chekiang, Kwangtung, Hongkong, Kwangsi, Kweichow, Yunnan, Szechuan).

1846年に Turczaninow は日本からホルトノキ属の2新種を記載したが、その名は其後すっかり忘れられてしまった。最近ジェネーブの Baehni, Weibel 兩博士の好意によりその副基準標本の一部と寫眞を見る事ができ、それが我がホルトノキ及びコバンモチである事が明になった。ホルトノキの學名については今迄に色々の意見が出された。最も古いしかも日本産の名に基いた *Elaeocarpus ellipticus* (Thunb.) Makino が、他の古い同名があるため使用できないので益々面倒になった。

我國のホルトノキは萼片の長さ3-4mm 両面に細伏毛があり、花瓣は長さ4-5mm 下部は細縁毛を有し内面は殆ど無毛か或は基部に細毛を散生し、雄蕊は25-34本、葯の先端に時に1-2本の剛毛がある。琉球(沖縄、石垣島)のものもこれと殆ど一致する。もつとも生育地の状況、個體の差異其他により、葉の大きさ、質、光澤、花の大きさ、毛、花梗の長さ等に多少の變化は見られるが、本州中部の暖地(房総以西)から四國九州濟州島琉球臺灣北部に迄及ぶものは明かに同一種に屬する。一方南支に見られる型は、花が小さく、萼片外面の毛が少いが花瓣は反つて下部に密に細毛を有し、雄蕊は數少く14-21本である。しかし支那産にも可成りの變異があり、又臺灣には中間形も見られるので上記2型は大きく同一の種に屬するものと考えてよからう。なお中支には近縁の別種もある。*E. decipiens* Hemsl. は基準標本の定め方によつてホルトノキにも南支の型にもとりうる。近年印度支那産に基いた *E. sylvestris* (Lour.) Poiret が最も早い種名として用いられる様になったが、その基準標本は日本のものからずれた形であり、ホルトノキ

は廣義の本種分布區域の北部を占める地理的變種 *var. ellipticus* (Thunb.) Hara とみなすのが妥當と思う。しかし若しホルトノキを獨立種として扱う場合には *E. Zollingeri* K. Koch の名がよい。

コバンモチの學名は *E. japonicus* Sieb. et Zucc. で差支えなく、*E. japonicus* Sieb. は植物學的記載を伴わず裸名である。本種は雌雄異株で、花瓣は往々先端に少數の鈍齒があり、葯は縦裂するか又は先端で開口している標本もある。紀伊和泉以西中國地方から南へ臺灣中南支にまで分布し、臺灣のものは葉が狹長である。

○ ウチワゴケとヒトツバジュウモンジシダ北海道に産す (佐々木太一) Taichi SASAKI: Some ferns new to Hokkaido.

本州、四國、九州地方に産するウチワゴケを著者は 1948 年 4 月北海道石狩國上川郡神居村字共和にて採集した。又同じく上川郡中愛別の石垣山にも産する (笹田興一氏同年 5 月採集)。これで本道のコケシノブ科はコケシノブ、キタコガネシノブ、ウチワゴケの 3 種類となつた。

ヒトツバジュウモンジシダの産地として發表されているのは關西では丹波、近江、出雲地方、關東では相模の鷹取山 (本誌 10 卷 10 號 676 頁) であると思うが、著者は現住地である北海道天鹽國士別町字西士別の林中にて 1949 年 11 月採集した。上記のウチワゴケ及び本變種は未だ北海道より報告されていないと思われるので此處に記した。

○ サナギイチゴと尾張本草學 (前川文夫) Fumio MAEKAWA: Some plants named by herbarists of Owari Province.

白井光太郎博士、樹木和名考: 410 に本種は尾州猿投山か豆州サナゲ山、いずれかの産によるものとしてある。前者は愛知縣の中央より稍々西寄り尾三國境上の猿投 (サナゲ) 山 (629m) であり後者は伊豆西北端達摩山の西にある眞城 (サナギ) 山 (502m) であろう。本草圖譜にいちご一種尾州の産とあるものは本種であるからまず前者即ち猿投山に産するイチゴと尾州の本草家がつけたものであろう。福士幸次郎氏、原日本考續編 (昭 18): 165 に説くが如き猿投山の今一つ前の語源即ち古代の鐸所 (サナギド) の信仰に關連したのではよもあるまい。尾州名古屋は徳川末期に日本本草學の一中心であつたから當時の周邊の好採集地に因む命名が大分あり、本種もその一つだが、二三例をあげると、ホングウシダ (*Asplenium oligophlebium* Bak.) = 愛知縣丹羽郡犬山の東南方二の宮の本宮山 (293m)、フジシダ (*Phlopterus Maximowiczii* Hance) = 上記の北に並ぶ小富士山 (277m)、トウゴクシダ (*Dryopteris cystolepidota* C. Chr.) = 同縣東春日井郡中央線高藏寺驛の南方にある東谷山 (198m)、イナモリソウ (*Pseudopyxis depressa* Miq.) = 三重縣三重郡菰野町の稻守谷 500m 前後 (稻森山は誤り、伊藤武夫氏三重縣植物誌上: 231 による)、フクオウソウ (*Nabalus acerifolia* Nakai) = 上記の北方、朝上村福王山 (591m) などがある。東京近郊の本門寺スゲ、白子スゲ、野火止ザサ、飯能ツツジ、刈寄ウツギなども先になつてからきつと判りにぐくなくて、こんな雜錄の種になることだろう。